

LOUISIANA BALANCE OF STATE CONTINUUM OF CARE

HUD CoC Program

2015 Project Evaluation

Introduction

HUD conducts an annual CoC program national competition. The Louisiana Housing Corporation is the collaborative applicant responsible for completing and submitting an annual application for CoC funding on behalf of the BoS CoC. In response to the limited availability of project funding expected, the Louisiana Balance of State Continuum of Care (LA BoS CoC) has established A Standards Rating and Project Selection Committee for the purpose of developing the CoC project evaluation and ranking process and tools. It is hoped that the evaluation process and prioritization strategy will help the LA BoS CoC fully maximize CoC Program funds and make decisions related to project funding.

CoC Renewal Project Evaluation Process

Project Evaluation: Overview

The LA BoS CoC Standards Rating and Project Selection Committee developed a CoC Renewal Project evaluation process and tool that will be used to review, score, and rank all CoC Projects as part of the 2015 CoC Competition. The priority areas that will be reviewed are as follows:

Project Participant Impact

- Housing stability
- Access to income and benefits
- Length of time homeless

Meeting Community Need

- Bed utilization
- Targeting hard to serve persons/households

Project Capacity

- Meeting reporting requirements
- Unspent funds
- HMIS data quality
- 2015 leverage documentation
- Audit/monitoring findings

Data Sources

Almost all data used in project evaluation comes from projects' most recently submitted Annual Performance Reports (APRs). However, information in four Project Capacity priority areas can only be obtained directly from providers themselves:

1. HUD audit/monitoring findings documentation;
2. Information on unspent funds from each applicant's LOCCS accounts;
3. Information on HIC/PIT data submission will be provided by the CoC lead; and
4. Applicants will provide information on project leverage.

Details about the data source for each priority area are listed in the Criteria and Scoring Tool in Appendix B. Details about the submission process and timeline follow.

CoC Project Evaluation

The LA BoS CoC Standards Rating and Project Selection Committee will complete a Project Evaluation for each project application (see Appendix B for Criteria and Scoring Tool). Projects failing to submit required information for a priority area will receive zero points for that priority area.

A list of all LA BoS CoC 2015 Renewal Projects can be found in Appendix A of this document.

After completing all Renewal Project Evaluations the LA BoS CoC Standards Rating and Project Selection Committee will rank all renewal projects according to their evaluation score within the categories listed below. The categories will be ranked in the following order; therefore the highest scoring PH application to the lowest scoring PH application will be ranked in front of any New Reallocated PSH applications.

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Renewal PH: PSH and RRH | 5. New Reallocated SSO Projects for Coordinated Access |
| 2. Renewal HMIS | 8. All other Renewal SSO projects |
| 3. New Re-allocated PSH serving chronically homeless individuals or families, including unaccompanied youth | 9. Any other project application submitted by the CoC that was not on the HUD-approved GIW |
| 4. New Re-allocated RRH for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth, coming directly from the streets or emergency shelter or fleeing domestic violence | |

Submission of Project Information

Any projects planning NOT to renew CoC funding, must let the CoC Board know ASAP.

Submission of Project Information

Renewal Projects will need to provide some information to the CoC as part of the project evaluation process. All projects will need to provide the following items:

- Most recent Annual Performance Report (APR) for each project application
- Project applications downloaded from esnaps
- Most recent HUD audit/monitoring results²
 - If there were findings that have since been resolved, please provide documentation from HUD
 - If there were findings that are currently being resolved, please provide an explanation of what efforts are currently underway

² If the project applicant has not had a HUD audit/monitoring visit please write a letter indicating that HUD has not visited the agency for that purpose. Write the letter on the agency letterhead and add the Executive Director's signature.

- 2015 CoC project leverage documentation
 - This should include all cash/in-kind match and leverage commitment letters reported as part of the 2015 CoC Competition
- LOCCS data
 - Monthly drawdown records for the project years 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 to date

All documentation must be emailed to Jwesley@lhc.la.gov by October 21, 2015.

Failure to submit a timely APR, or any of the items mentioned above will automatically result in a lower scoring project evaluation and a lower ranking among renewal projects.

APPENDIX A

LA BoS CoC 2015 Renewal CoC Project Evaluation: List of 2015 Renewal CoC Projects

| Applicant Name | Project Name | Expiration Date | First-Time Former Project under the SHP or S+C Program | Project Component |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Calcasieu Parish Police Jury Housing Department | 2013 Exhibit 2 | 5/31/2016 | CoC | PH |
| Housing Authority of the City of Sulphur | Shelter Plus Care 2014 | 6/30/2016 | CoC | PH |
| Lake Charles Housing Authority | Lake Charles S+C Program | 9/30/2016 | CoC | PH |
| Volunteer Center Southwest Louisiana, Inc. | 310INFO/211 HMIS | 6/30/2016 | CoC | HMIS |
| Louisiana Housing Authority | Shelter Plus Care | | S+C | |

APPENDIX B

**Projects achieving the goal will receive full points for the priority area. Projects coming within 5 percentage points of the goal will receive 75% of the available points for the priority area.*

2015 LA BoS CoC Renewal CoC Project Evaluation

Criteria and Scoring Tool

| Project Participant Impact | Standard | Points | Scoring | Data Source | Points Awarded |
|---|----------|--------|--|-------------|----------------|
| Housing Stability | | | | | |
| PSH Programs: Length of stay 6 months or longer | 83% | 10 | 83% or > = 10 78-82% = 7.5 Below 78%=0 | APR | |
| PSH Programs: Housing Retention HUD Measure [remaining in PSH at end of year or moving to other permanent housing during year] | 77% | 10 | 77% or > = 10 72 – 76% = 7.5 Below 72%=0 | APR | |
| All Programs: Exits to family/friends (permanent tenure) | 14% | 10 | 14% or < = 10 19-15% = 7.5 Above 19%=0 | APR | |
| Access to Income and Benefits | | | | | |
| PSH Programs: Participants employed at exit | 17% | 10 | 17% or > = 10 12-16% = 7.5 Below 12%=0 | APR | |
| All Programs: Participants with one or more source(s) of non-cash benefits by program exit | 32% | 10 | 32% or > = 10 27 – 31% = 7.5 Below 27%=0 | APR | |
| All Programs: Participants age 18 and older who obtained mainstream benefits by program exit | 27% | 10 | 27% or > = 10 22 – 26% = 7.5 Below 22%=0 | APR | |
| All Programs: Participants age 18 and older who maintained or increased their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit | 73% | 10 | 73% or > = 10 68 – 72% = 7.5 Below 68%=0 | APR | |
| Length of Time Homeless | | | | | |

| Meeting Community Need | Standard | Points | Scoring | Data Source | Points Awarded |
|--|---|---------------|---|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Project Demand | | | | | |
| PSH Programs: Average daily bed utilization | 84% | 10 | 84% > = 10 79 - 83% = 7.5 Below 79% = 0 | APR | |
| Targeting Hard to Serve | | | | | |
| All Programs: Entries from streets/emergency shelters only | 76% | 10 | 76% > = 10 71 - 85% = 7.5 Below 71% = 0 | APR | |
| All Programs: Entries with no income | 48% | 10 | 48% > = 10 43 - 47% = 7.5 Below 43% = 0 | APR | |
| Project Capacity | Standard | Points | Scoring | Data Source | Points Awarded |
| Reporting Requirements | | | | | |
| All Programs: HIC/PIT data submitted on time | Yes | 5 | Yes = 5 No = 0 | LHA | |
| Cost Effectiveness | | | | | |
| All Programs: 2012 – 2013 Total CoC Funds Expended/Awarded | < 5% of unspent funds | 7.5 | 5% < = 7.5 6-10% = 5.63 Above 10% = 0 | LOCCS | |
| All Programs: 2013 – 2014 Total CoC Funds Expended/Awarded | < 5% of unspent | 7.5 | 5% < = 7.5 Above 10% = 0 | LOCCS | |
| All Programs: On track to spend current CoC award | Unspent funds < 10% of combined Mo. Average | 5 | 10% < = 7.5 11-15% = 3.75 Above 15% = 0 | LOCCS | |
| HMIS Data Quality | | | | | |
| All Programs: Missing data in "Q7. Data Quality" | < 2% | 15 | 2% < = 15 3-7% = 11.25 Above 7% = 0 | APR | |
| Project Leverage | | | | | |
| All Programs: 2015 CoC Application leverage documented | > 150% | 10 | Yes = 10 No = 0 | Project Application | |

| Project Monitoring Results | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|--|-----------|--|
| All Programs: Any unresolved HUD monitoring findings noted? | HUD Monitoring findings | 10 | None/resolved = 10 Unresolved findings= 0 | LHC Staff | |
| Total Possible Points | | Total Points | | | |
| Total Possible Points | | 160 | | | |
| Total Possible Points—All Programs | | 120 | | | |